

# Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. VIII, No. 18

NOVEMBER 1, 1948

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

## The Presidential Campaign

A DREARY presidential campaign is drawing to its close. Perhaps it has been so uninteresting because the outcome is obvious. Mr. Dewey will be elected. Perhaps it has been dreary because no great personalities or issues have been engaged in it.

The conclusion is foregone for several reasons. The political alliance which Franklin Roosevelt constructed, and which consisted of a curious partnership of Southern Democrats, municipal bosses and the laboring masses, disintegrated. It was held together by the tactical skill of one of the shrewdest political leaders who ever held our presidential office. It would not have outlasted Roosevelt's life in any event; and it might have come to an end even if he had lived. One part of the alliance is now in the camp of the "Dixicrats" whose creed is summed up in the issue of "states rights" and whose real concern is the preservation of "white supremacy" in southern states. There is an ironic touch in their revolt because it was occasioned by Truman's frontal attack upon their creed, which was much more unequivocal than any Roosevelt, in his shrewdness, would have dared to make. Virtue is not always rewarded in politics, particularly not if "charm" and tactical skill do not accompany its exercise.

Another part of the old Roosevelt alliance is presumably in Henry Wallace's camp. Actually the great forces of organized labor are not with Mr. Wallace. They will vote for Mr. Truman without much enthusiasm but they will certainly not vote for Mr. Wallace. They have worked too hard to eliminate Communist influence from their unions to give support to a party in which Communists and their sympathizers hold all the levers of power. Over a million people who are not Communists will vote for Mr. Wallace. They will do so partly because they want to register a protest vote against the old parties on domestic issues and partly because they honestly believe that Mr. Wallace could establish peace with Russia, if he had the chance. Our foreign policy being far from perfect, a really great statesman might give it a new creative impulse which would put our cause on the moral offensive rather than the defensive. But such a venture is not within the competence of Mr. Wallace. It would have to be made in any case by political forces which are

free of every shred of suspicion, that they are motivated by the fantastic loyalty to another nation, which is the inspiration of a deluded "left" minority in every Western nation. Our guess is that Mr. Wallace, far from becoming the architect of an enduring "third party," will end his days in oblivion, which is the undeserved fate of some "idealists" in politics and the deserved fate of those who mix sentimentality with political chicane.

Thus the "grand alliance" of the Rooseveltian period is dead. Mr. Truman's small stature, only slightly heightened by his "scrappy" campaign, serves to minimize the regret which the "liberal" portion of the nation might have about its passing. Mr. Truman's final meddling venture in foreign policy, probably prompted by a desire to gain a few votes, actually cost him many a supporter among the more sophisticated portion of the electorate. The idea that he might be able to pull a rabbit out of a hat by sending Chief Justice Vinson to Moscow after our dispute with Russia had been submitted to the United Nations, proved beyond doubt that Mr. Truman does not understand foreign policy. We may be grateful that the team, to which he has entrusted our foreign affairs was, on the whole, a good one; and that he interfered only occasionally with their conduct of foreign affairs.

Mr. Dewey would like to have us believe that the reigns of power may be turned over to his firm hands with great relief. We may be grateful that he himself seems to have been pretty thoroughly converted from his erstwhile isolationism, and that on the whole the Republican party has assumed a responsible role in the conduct of our foreign affairs. But we might well withhold our sense of relief until we know how well Mr. Dewey manages that part of his party which came within an ace, only a few months ago, of wrecking the European Recovery Program.

In domestic policy we are in the dark. Mr. Dewey has not revealed any policy. He has spoken endlessly on national unity and of efficiency in the administration of public affairs. In a democracy national unity is an empty reality if it is not gained within and above the struggle over policy which is the heart of the democratic process. Efficiency in

administration is only an ancillary good. The real question always is: what is the policy? The only policy question which emerged for a moment in the campaign's turgid oratory was on the relation between the program of guaranteeing farm prices to the problem of high food costs. Mr. Stassen spoke an honest word about that problem. But it was immediately repudiated. Both sides lacked candor in dealing with it; for both assured the farmers that the price of farm products would be artificially sustained, while they promised city dwellers a reduction of living costs.

One may assume that a Republican administration will be more reluctant to place restraints upon free enterprise than a Democratic administration; yet Mr. Dewey is a shrewd enough politician not to follow a theory through to as consistent a conclusion as some others who might have been nominated for the presidency. In any event the Republican Party has learned some lessons in its sixteen years in the wilderness of powerlessness. It returns to the seats of power, too sober to destroy all the social gains

which have been secured during its banishment from power.

Yet so little has been said in the campaign about specific policies that the nation does not know to what the election will have committed it. The presidential election has become, in fact, a kind of vast ritual rather than a national debate on important issues. The ritual assumes that thoughtful citizens are "making up their minds" on important issues. The facts are more deterministic. Political life in a democracy is partly determined by the "swing of the pendulum." Sixteen years is the maximum breadth of its parabola. So "its time for a change."

Therefore we wish Mr. Dewey well without too much enthusiasm and look to Mr. Truman's defeat without too much regret. Perhaps the Democratic Party will be refashioned into a more genuine instrument of liberalism during its years in the wilderness; even as the Republican Party has been purged of some of its aberrations during its exile. One could wish for more vital debates in our elections; but they still ensure that no group will hold power too long.

R. N.

## Needed: A Christian Philosophy of Force

JOHN CROSBY BROWN

**D**URING the past months there has been an alarming recrudescence in the statements of leading churchmen of an unrealistic attitude toward military force which was rampant in the Protestant Churches in the middle thirties and did much to aid the triumph of totalitarianism and bring on the Second World War. This attitude is that if you use the threat of war as a deterrent you must prepare for war; if you prepare for war you will inevitably go to war because "the means determine the end." This false assumption gives impetus to the efforts of an influential segment of our clergy to circumscribe or defeat the program of our government to mobilize sufficient military power and political cohesion between the Western democracies to protect the domain of liberty against further Soviet aggression. Should our rearmament program be crippled the result would be a major setback to the cause of peace.

The danger was enhanced by the exchange of notes which took place late last spring between Ambassador W. Bedell Smith and Mr. Molotov, the statement of Henry Wallace on American-Soviet relations and Mr. Stalin's reply that the Wallace statement is a satisfactory basis for the discussion of differences between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. These conciliatory words by Messrs. Stalin and

Molotov reinforced the views of those who depreciate the role of military force in the American program for peace. Is it not significant, however, that the first break in three years in the Soviet armor of *intransigent* hostility followed immediately upon such moves as the active negotiations looking toward a five nation European military alliance against aggression, the strong reaffirmation of the Truman Doctrine which commits the United States to "the support of free peoples who are resisting subjugation by armed minorities or outward pressure," the proposals of the Truman Administration for peacetime conscription and U. M. T., and the voting by the American Congress of a seventy group air force?

Mr. Sumner Welles, who cannot be reasonably accused of possessing "the military mind," had this to say of the Bedell Smith-Molotov exchange\*: "Molotov's announcement of his willingness to begin 'a discussion and settlement of differences existing' between Russia and the United States is added proof that the Kremlin has studied the tactics so successfully employed by Hitler during the years before 1939.

"It is propaganda designed to weaken western Europe's will for resistance and for unity. It is

\* New York Herald Tribune, May 18, 1948.

intended to deceive the gullible here and in the other democracies as to the true nature of the Soviet Union's aims. It is so timed as to lessen popular support for American rearmament and persuade Congress that passage of legislation that is essential to American security can be safely postponed until after the national elections.

"Any attempt on our part to negotiate an over-all settlement before the Politburo knows that American rearmament has taken place would be a fatal mistake. The Soviet Government will only conclude the kind of settlement that can make for lasting peace when it has become convinced that the strength and tenacity of the West are equal to its own.

"A negotiation now would either end in a futile compromise by appeasement or in a stalemate that would serve Moscow as a pretext for further expansion."

This highly realistic bit of political thinking reflects a viewpoint on the role of military force directly opposite to that of the doctrine that "the means determine the end." Mr. Welles obviously sees military force as a morally neutral factor, an instrument for either good or evil, depending on the ends for which it is used. He considers American rearmament necessary to prevent war and hence a means to a good end. This, I submit, is clear Christian thinking. It is a basic Christian assumption that beliefs mold men and determine conduct. It follows that mind, motive and will are dominant over means and that, therefore, the problem for Christians—other than absolute pacifists—is not how to dispense with military force, but how to use it for Christian ends.

## II.

Let me very briefly apply this reasoning to American policy in dealing with the Soviet Union. In the first place, the Christian emphasis on the importance of belief should warn us not to underestimate the significance of Communist ideology. Communism is a religion with a set of dogmas different from but as fervently held as the Christian dogmas, and we should expect from the Soviet rulers conduct consistent with these dogmas. This is a source of danger for the immediately foreseeable future but of hope for the ultimate outcome. Among the Marxian dogmas are the beliefs that capitalism is basically bad, that its destruction is inevitable, and that the proletariat is under obligation to assist in that destruction and to take power into its own hands. There is also the concept that any means, including the establishment of ruthless dictatorship, are justified in the struggle to bring about a classless society. As long as these concepts govern the conduct of the Soviet rulers we may expect a policy of irreconcilable antagonism toward the democracies on their part, regardless of temporary interludes of apparent friendliness arranged for tactical reasons.

Soviet dogmas, however, are materialistic and hence subject to proof or disproof by material means. This is a source of hope. Capitalistic disintegration is basic in the calculations of the present Soviet rulers. If the democracies can demonstrate over a prolonged period their capacity to proceed without major depressions and with a rising standard of living for their people, this Soviet dogma will be refuted in a manner difficult to disregard. Under such circumstances it seems not unreasonable to expect ultimate changes of attitude on the part of at least some Communist leaders which will be reflected in a more accommodating policy of live and let live toward the Western powers. Thus, if we can contain Soviet expansion without war for years, even decades of uneasy peace, we have the right to look forward to an ultimate stable and lasting peace.

To this end I suggest as the principles which should govern decisions on our foreign policy the following:

1. Make peaceful cooperation as attractive as possible.
2. Make aggression as unattractive as possible.

Fundamentally, this is precisely what the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States under the Truman Administration is doing.

There is, so far as I know, no disagreement between church and administration leaders on the importance of measures of peaceful reconstruction like the Marshall Plan and the Reciprocal Trade Program. Both President Truman and Secretary Marshall have repeatedly asserted their belief in the primary importance of such measures both for immediate recovery and lasting peace. The majority of our government leaders would, I am confident, heartily endorse the positive recommendations to promote economic recovery, social justice and peace contained in the recent "Positive Program for Peace" presented to President Truman on April 30th by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches.

Further aspects of our bipartisan foreign policy are as follows: support the U.N. to the fullest possible degree; avoid radical amendments such as the removal of the veto power which would almost certainly result in the departure of Russia from the organization; recognize that without an ultimate revival of trade between the nations within and without "the Iron Curtain" the Marshall Plan cannot work, so keep economic as well as political channels open as far as possible; always work and hope for the day when the Soviet will change its mind and attitude and be willing to adopt friendly cooperation with the Western world; keep the gate to peace open.

But keep the gate to aggression shut. This is the purpose of the Truman Doctrine, regional alliances under Article 51 of the U.N. Charter and the rearmament of the U.S.A. and the democracies. These



measures are regarded as essential by the Administration in view of the paralysis of the U.N. Security Council as a law enforcing agency through the misuse of the veto power by the Soviet Union. They are measures consistent with the U.N. Charter in support of the fundamental purpose of the U.N. to provide its members with security against aggression. They are measures to use force preventively in support of international law and order. Our government considers that the strengthening of our air power, peacetime conscription and U.M.T. are essential to the effective support of the foregoing.

This program has been proven necessary by painful post-war experience, the results of which may be summarized as follows: Conciliation plus disarmament by the democracies fosters Soviet aggression. Firmness plus armament by the democracies fosters Soviet accommodation. Despite the overwhelming evidence in support of the foregoing analysis, the course advocated by many influential religious leaders today can fairly be expressed in the following formula:

1. Make peaceful cooperation as attractive as possible.
2. Make aggression as attractive as possible

The second approach, expressed through opposition to the Truman Doctrine, regional security pacts, peacetime conscription, U.M.T. and rearmament in general, cancels the first and, if adopted by our government, would paralyze all our efforts for peaceful reconstruction. It is the offspring of the false dogma that "the means determine the end." We need from our religious leaders a new and more realistic approach to the role of force in a violent age. We need their guidance on how to make a consecrated use of force in support of a diplomacy directed at the two-fold aim of protecting the domain of liberty and preserving the peace.

### III.

The "Positive Program for Peace" of the Federal Council of Churches, the May 6th statement of the General Conference of the Methodist Church, and other statements of ecclesiastical bodies in similar vein, have rendered an important service in warning our people against exclusive reliance on military force as an antidote to Communism, in urging that control of all phases of national policy be kept in civilian hands, and in emphasizing the need of positive measures for improving the conditions of poverty, injustice and insecurity on which Communism thrives. The Federal Council is particularly to be commended for its penetrating analysis of the role of terror as an instrument of Communist expansion and for its recommendation that the nations take "joint and separate action in cooperation with the United Nations" to safeguard human rights so that men everywhere may vote and act freely in ac-

cordance with their convictions without fear of violent reprisals.

It is to be feared, however, that the messages of these religious bodies, which are timely and true as far as they go, will lose much of their influence because of failure to recognize the need of vigorous military measures to supplement and reinforce the program of pacification. A Committee of the U.N., for example, under the vigorous leadership of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, has been doing its utmost for more than a year to promote precisely the program to safeguard human rights which the Federal Council recommends, only to have its efforts reduced to a dead letter in all places where Soviet power extends. It is unfortunate but true that only where political freedom is protected by military power can human rights be safeguarded in the present violent world. Yet, while admitting that "national military strength is necessary" under present conditions, the Federal Council statement does not support the Truman Doctrine or rearmament, and the Methodist statement actively opposes peacetime conscription and U.M.T.

Because they thus minimize the role of force, the religious statements, to which I have referred, present an over-simplified approach to the problem which the free peoples are facing. This problem is how to promote the conditions of law, order and prosperity on which lasting peace depends while simultaneously safeguarding the domain of liberty against the ruthless expansionist drive of the Soviet dictatorship with a record of three years of successful aggression behind it. The statements of the religious leaders deal effectively with the first aspect of the problem. They fail to deal adequately with the second equally important aspect. Thus they lack balance and realism. The statements are reminiscent of a long stream of ecclesiastical pronouncements during the 1930's when extremely appealing measures for social justice and international good will were proposed, but the problem of how to stop the assault on civilization of Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese war lords was ignored or evaded.

The statements I have mentioned, which may be assumed to represent a widespread attitude among American Protestants, are inadequate because they fail to come squarely to grips with one of the most crucial spiritual issues of our time—the role of military force in a Christian foreign policy. Fundamentally this is a theological issue which involves the question of the proper relation between means and ends. So far as I know, this issue has never been resolved by the Protestant Churches so that they could join in the formulation of a clearcut, easily understandable philosophy of force for the guidance of their members. By a Christian philosophy of force I mean a statement on the role of force derived from the teachings of Christ and the historic traditions of the church which its adherents can and will consistently adhere to in speech and action

both in peace and in war. In view of the division between pacifists and non-pacifists there would doubtless need to be majority and minority reports on those phases of the issue on which these groups disagree. What is desperately needed is a philosophy within the framework of which both groups can reconcile their professions with their practice under all conceivable conditions of war or peace. Such a condition did not exist in the nineteen thirties, and there are growing indications that it does not exist today.

May I suggest as an essential first step toward the formulation of a consistent Christian philosophy of force the rejection without compromise of the doctrine that "the means determine the end,"—a doctrine with so pervasive a grip on modern thought that it may properly be termed a dogma. In the first place, this dogma is thoroughly materialistic. It concedes the dominance of matter over mind. It subordinates the influence of the spiritual attitude—the motive and intent—to the influence of the outward act. Such an attitude places the use of armed force in support of law, justice and freedom on the same moral plane as the use of armed force for murder, rape or aggression. Christ taught the opposite—that inner spiritual attitude, motive and intent are supremely important, and that these, when checked by the test of results, ("by their fruits ye shall know them") predominantly determine the morality of actions. Human experience confirms this teaching.

One of the most serious consequences of the doctrine that "the means determine the end" was the refusal of the Western democracies after the First World War to enter into firm military commitments to come to one another's aid in the event of aggression because they feared that "commitments lead to war." This failure, by the encouragement which it gave to Hitler, directly led to the Second World War. On the contrary, the lesson of history is that not the means but the motive, the spirit and the purpose determine the end. Within nations the commitment of the government to use force in support of law has preserved peace over wide areas for long periods. And it is the opinion of statesmen in the best position to know, that commitments properly used could have prevented both the First and the Second World Wars. Mr. Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England during the First World War, when asked on one occasion whether that war could have been avoided, replied as follows: "Yes, the Great War could have been prevented. If those nations which did in fact enter the field against Germany had said beforehand that they would do so unless Germany changed her policy, there would have been no war; for Germany would have changed her policy." And Mr. Churchill in his recent memoirs has shown how easily World War II could have been prevented if the members of the League of Nations had lived up to their commitments.

A favorite contention of those who maintain that "the means determine the end" is that war makes over those who engage in it in its own image. Being inconceivably brutal, it brutalizes those who participate. Being essentially dictatorial and operating on the basis of command and obedience, it destroys the soldier's capacity to understand and appreciate democracy. No democratic people, it was frequently claimed in the nineteen thirties, can go through a modern war without permanently surrendering its liberties.

All these contentions are refuted by history. Washington, Lee, Eisenhower, Marshall and Bradley are representative of a host of American soldiers who knew how to fight without hating and to make military force the servant of democracy. After each of its country's wars the American people have emerged more passionately devoted than before to their democratic liberties.

#### IV.

It is important to recognize how dangerous and demoralizing is the false dogma that "the means determine the end."

It is dangerous because it leads the clergy to substitute their own judgment for the preponderant judgment of our military leaders on what constitutes an effective security program. The lives of millions are at stake. Who are better qualified to pass on this highly technical problem than our three great generals—Marshall, Eisenhower and Bradley—who demonstrated the imagination, flexibility and resourcefulness to solve the unprecedented military problems of the Second World War? All three of these regard both peacetime conscription and U.M.T. as essential to our national security. What is there in the experience of the average clergyman which renders him competent to challenge this judgment? The clergy assume an awesome responsibility in doing so.

Here again we encounter the baneful influence of the dogma that means dominate ends. The clergy for the most part do not oppose peacetime conscription and U.M.T. on technical but on moral grounds. They believe that these military measures will engender the spirit of militarism in our people and hence lead them to aggression and war. They believe that men like Generals Marshall, Eisenhower and Bradley do not appreciate these spiritual dangers because they have "the military mind" and hence are incapable of attaching the same importance to peace, democracy and Christian values as do the clergy. They are bound to think these things as long as they are misled by the false materialistic dogma that "the means determine the end."

I suggest that, on the contrary, belief, motive and purpose are the dominating factors in conduct. The careers of Generals Marshall, Eisenhower and Brad-

ley are filled with evidence that they have fully as deep a devotion to peace and democracy, and are fully as well equipped with the Christian qualities of humility, reverence, charity, mercy and faith as most clergymen are. It seems to me, in fact, that on the issues of peacetime conscription and U.M.T. they show a truer understanding of democracy than their critics among the clergy. What kind of faith in our American educational system is displayed by those who claim that the influence over a young American of fifteen years of education in democracy can be invalidated by one year of peacetime military training? This is equivalent to saying that American education is spiritually and morally bankrupt. I would trust Generals Marshall, Eisenhower and Bradley and the thousands of likeminded officers in our Armed Services to make U.M.T. a means of serving democracy, by inculcating in the trainees a devotion to duty and acceptance of discipline such as will vastly strengthen and reinforce the democratic values.

Irrefutable proof that the dogma that "the means determine the end" is demoralizing is provided by the fact that the majority of its adherents, though men of unquestioned moral integrity, cannot and do not act consistently with it both in peace and in war. They argue that because war is evil only evil can result from going to war. But the logical expression in action of this theory is absolute pacifism—refusal to use military force under any circumstances. This would be a consistent position for the clergy who argue that "the means determine the end." The overwhelming majority of the American clergy, however, did not take the complete pacifist position during the Second World War. After a decade of impressive resolutions denouncing and renouncing war, and saying that the church under no circumstances would have anything more to do with war, they supported the Government almost to a man after Pearl Harbor and advised the young men in their congregations to take part in the most terrible war in history. They were right to do so, because only by war could the democracies prevent the enthronement of victorious evil for an indefinite time over the destinies of mankind. But their wartime conduct was wholly inconsistent with their peacetime professions. There is little reason to doubt that in the event of a Third World War the clergy would follow a similar course. Hence the imperative need for a philosophy which will clear up the intellectual confusion which has contributed to these inconsistencies. Hence the need for a Christian philosophy of force.

The nucleus of the kind of statement of principles which I have in mind is already contained in the admirable report of the Calhoun Commission published in 1944. This represents the thinking of a group of the most eminent theologians of the Protestant Churches on the moral issues posed by war.

If generally distributed among the churches, the Calhoun Report would go a long way to resolving the confusions referred to in this article. But it is difficult to discern many traces of the thinking of the Calhoun Commission in the recent statements of leading religious bodies. Furthermore, the work of this Commission is almost totally unknown to laymen and probably not as widely known as it should be among the clergy. In any event the times call for a new and even more vigorous approach to this heart-searching problem. The challenge which confronts the best minds of the church is to frame a clearcut philosophy of force which Christians cannot only believe in but live up to under any and all circumstances.

## Correspondence

Dear Sir:

If Mr. Hudnut's article (Oct. 4, '48), "Toward a Christian Approach to Russia," had been written by a non-Christian what would have been the difference? As a political realist with a sense of responsibility for the freedom of the world, Mr. Hudnut has very nicely disclosed the irrelevance of an ethic of pure love when applied to the political situation. It is always a pleasure to reveal the weaknesses of the *children of light*. It is also *easy* if one disregards the contribution that they make, and it is especially easy if simplicity prevails and one fails to see the relevancy of the irrelevant.

For those of us who have learned, partly through this journal, to appreciate the paradox which is at the center of the Christian faith, it is a disappointment to read an article which, although not without truth, in its analysis of our relation to another power displays so little self-criticism. What assurance do the readers of this journal have that Mr. Hudnut's article is any more than a projection of our self-interest? Are there no ideological undertones to this writing which are either more or less than the Gospel of Jesus Christ? For those of us who have come to believe that the Holy Spirit reveals God's truth *across the grain* of our interests, Mr. Hudnut's analysis will be strangely lacking in humility.

One could enter into debate with Mr. Hudnut at many points. How can one say that "we gave Russia costly and unstinting material help during and after the war" without qualifying that statement so that it would be clear that our security as well as our responsibility was involved in that act. Perhaps "it would be difficult to find a person in Belgium or Britain who fears that our bombs will be used against them," but it would not, I think, be difficult to find enlightened people in both countries who are worried about the Curtain of Gold, our over-concentration of economic power, a concentration which, in spite of the European Recovery act, could destroy the hopes of recovery on the Continent. Mr. Hudnut, because of a defective understanding of the nature of power, is as naive about the United States as was the sentimental parson about the Soviet Union.

Wellesley, Massachusetts

FRED DENBEAUX.



# The World Church: News and Notes

## German Religious Socialists Reestablish Association

Dissolved by the Nazis in 1933, the Association of Religious Socialists in Germany has been reestablished in Nuremberg by the Joint Working Committee for Christianity and Socialism.

The association has already resumed publication of its newspaper, "Working People's Sunday News."  
(Religious News Service)

## Presbyterians Report Chinese Communists Protecting Missionaries

American and British missionaries in Communist-held Tsinan are "safe and well," according to a report received at Presbyterian headquarters in Shanghai from missions officials in Tsingtao, about 200 miles from Tsinan.

The report stated: "All foreigners in Tsinan are well and engaged in useful employment. There are no financial or food problems, and the Cheloo mission has been spared, although some damage to property has occurred."

According to Presbyterian officials in Shanghai, the report indicates that "the Communists are continuing their new policy of protecting missionaries, especially medical workers."  
(Religious News Service)

## Interview with Prof. Karl Barth

Dr. J. L. Witte, S.J., who represented the Roman Catholic weekly "De Linie" at the Amsterdam Assembly had an interview with Prof. Karl Barth, a report of which is given in that paper.

"It became quite clear to us," says Dr. Witte, "that Barth has an entirely wrong conception of the contribution that may be made to Christ's work of redemption. From his point of view I can now understand that he looks upon the Roman Catholic Church as his personal foe, but it has been painful to me and to many non-Catholics that he spoke in his speech at the Assembly of 'angeblich Christentum' and of 'ausgerechnet Rom und Moskau,' who refuse every contact with the World Council.

"You might have known," Dr. Witte said to Karl Barth, "that Moskau would be identified with communism and that one would not only think of the Russian Orthodox Church."

"To be honest," said Prof. Barth, "I see some connection between them. Both are totalitarian; both claim man as a whole. Communism uses about the same methods of organization (learned from the Jesuits). Both lay great stress on all that is visible. But Roman Catholicism is the more dangerous of the two for Protestantism. Communism will pass; Roman Catholicism is lasting."

Dr. Witte then asked Karl Barth: "If this is your opinion of the Roman Catholic Church, do you then think that the World Council should develop in an anti-Roman block?" With a smile he answered: "Leider ist es das nicht!" Dr. Witte remarked that Anglicans and Greek-Orthodox have a somewhat softer judgment of

the Roman Catholic Church. "Well," Barth answered, "I know the Roman Catholic Church better than those sentimental Americans and the mystical Florovsky. I know that the Roman Church is not content with a place beside the others. If I were Pope, I should have acted in the same way as the Roman Church does now."

## Missions Unite

Long-divided American Protestantism, represented by 3,500 delegates from 65 denominations in the United States and Canada, declared itself united in "the greatest co-operative program of world missionary service in church history."

Quick to respond to the appeal made by the First World Council of Churches which met in Amsterdam last month, the Foreign Mission Assembly, meeting in Columbus, Ohio, enthusiastically adopted a program of advance in foreign missions which was recommended to it by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America and endorsed by spokesmen of ten foreign countries in which missionary work is now progressing.

The enthusiasm which followed the announcement of Protestant agreement to follow what will be called the "One World in Christ" program confirmed earlier predictions that this three-day conference might mark an important milestone in the movement toward a united Christian Church.

Protestant leaders here expressed the opinion that "this is only the beginning." From Columbus delegates will return to their own communities to launch during the next three months a series of 36 regional assemblies in which Protestant unity will be stressed in a co-operative drive to extend public knowledge of foreign missions and expand the overseas program.

## Appeals for Agreement Between Hungarian Government, Church

Minister of Construction Joseph Darvas appealed to Hungarian Catholics to support efforts for an agreement between the government and the Catholic Church similar to "understandings" recently established with the Unitarian and Reformed Churches.

Speaking at Varpalota, in the center of the mining district, Darvas declared, however, that the government is not seeking an agreement with Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, but only with "priests and church members who believe in the Christ of the poor and the fallen."

During his speech, Darvas denounced Cardinal Mindszenty as the "most obdurate enemy of democracy" in Hungary.  
(Religious News Service)

## Romania Offers Church School Teachers Jobs in State Schools

Teachers who lost their jobs when Romania's church-controlled schools were nationalized under the new Cults Law may be hired as teachers in the State schools. Most of the instructors belonged to Roman Catholic schools, while others taught in Protestant, Jewish, or Moslem institutions.

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*  
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary</i>	

## CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	FRANCIS P. MILLER
UMPHREY LEE	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

An announcement by the Ministry of Education published in the press said that former teachers in parochial and other private schools may become teachers in the State schools if they pass certain examinations "by which they will be classified."

The ministry's announcement came as welcome news, especially to Catholic teachers, many of them nuns, who have been reportedly worried lest they be forced to leave the country "or starve." Moslem teachers were said to be finding difficulty in adjusting themselves to the new situation, while numbers of Jewish teachers were believed considering emigrating to Palestine.

However, although all groups appear to be grateful for the government's gesture, they are awaiting more

precise information from the Ministry of Education as to what its offer implies. This is true, particularly, in the case of Catholic authorities.

Questions being asked by Catholic leaders are whether priests may wear clerical garb while teaching in the State schools, and whether or not nuns will have to appear in civilian attire.

Both Catholic and Communist quarters appear to believe it will be impossible to reach a compromise, except in the teaching of languages and other subjects in which fundamental Christian concepts are not involved.

(Religious News Service)

## Lutheran Welfare Society Wins Fight To Establish DP Hostel in St. Paul

Efforts to keep the Lutheran Welfare Society of Minnesota from establishing a reception center in St. Paul, Minnesota, for European refugees have been defeated. The society is going ahead with its original plans for the project on the basis of action taken by the City Council of St. Paul, Oct. 6, to defer rezoning of the area for one year.

The first outright objection to the Lutheran program of resettlement of displaced persons in America developed when 125 residents of St. Paul opposed the proposed reception center.

In a petition to the St. Paul zoning board, neighbors requested that the area be rezoned for family residences only, thus excluding institutions of any kind. This appeal was denied by the zoning board on Sept. 21, and its action was upheld by the city council in a decision announced on Oct. 6.

The Twin City press, Mayor Hubert Humphrey of Minneapolis, Mayor John McDonough of St. Paul, and various civic and social groups all urged defeat of the petition.

Attorneys for the petitioners stated emphatically, "We want it clearly understood that the people in this neighborhood are not against the DP's."

Lutheran Welfare Society officials and their attorneys, however, claimed otherwise. The Rev. Henry Whiting, executive secretary of the society, the Rev. Carl Sandgren, pastor of the First Lutheran Church, St. Paul, and two attorneys had called on the petitioners to determine reasons for their opposition.

The reasons given to them were: "We don't want DP's because they are riff-raff and Communists"; "We don't want them because they are mostly Jews"; "We don't want any foreigners brought in here"; "We don't want these DP subversive characters to undermine our children."

Several of the petitioning neighbors, however, insisted that "this is a real estate matter. Our property values will go down if we allow this kind of a flop-house or transient hotel." When one pastor said that it was "a choice between souls and a dollar sign" several members of the neighborhood group said, "Why don't you put them in Minneapolis?"

## Author in This Issue

John Crosby Brown is president of Tamblyn and Brown, Inc., and is one of the sponsors of CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS.

Periodical Division  
Detroit Public Library  
5201 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-49